


#### Remarks

The applicant again thanks the examiner for discussing the Office Action in a telephone conversation, which was of particular importance in clarifying the questions surrounding Claim 4 (Office Action Par. 3). With the amended wording of Claim 1, Claim 4 now appears in proper context. When broadband illumination is used (Claim 3), if the detector can not distinguish different wavelengths, then a single time course of reflected light intensity will ensue, resulting in one set of parameters; however, when the reflected light is dispersed into its spectrum, then the analysis can be carried out on the time course at each individual wavelength (Claim 4), resulting in multiple sets of parameters. Thus Claim 4 differs from Claim 1 because of the multiplicity of time courses and parameter sets. The rewording of Claim 1 specifically addresses each issue in Pars. 5-8 of the Office Action.

Wherefore, it is requested that the objections be withdrawn and the application be acted upon favorably. If these amendments and remarks have not removed all objection, it is furthermore requested that the examiner contact the applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Frank A. Greco  
250 Grove Street  
Lexington, Massachusetts 02420-1014  
(781) 860-9161

Dated: April 28, 2006